road-makers, bridge-makers and other labourers not employed in factories?

MR. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—No.

MR. T. RAMACHANDRA.— Are the Government aware that the Whitley Commission have recommended that the Regulation must apply to labourers of all kinds?

MR. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—Yes. But, for the present, the Government have under consideration the question of extending the application of the Regulation on the lines of the Act in force in British India.

MR. T. RAMACHANDRA.—Are the workmen concerned informed of all the provisions of the Regulation by means of pamphlets?

MR. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—Copies are put up in the several factories concerned.

MR. T. RAMACHANDRA.—Have not the Whitley Commission recommended that the Act should be translated into the vernaculars and published as widely as possible?

MR. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—Yes, and it will be done to the extent possible.

MR. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—The statement appended to the answer refers to partial disablements in certain factories only. Have there not been cases of partial disablements in the Kolar Gold Fields?

MR. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—The particulars contained in the statement represent only those that were available at the time the answer was compiled.

MR. V. V. IYER.—Is not the Regulation applicable to factories in the Shimoga District? And if so, have there been any cases of compensation awarded in that area?

MR. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—The statement refers only to those cases in which the Labour Commissioner has received applications. Cases in which the factories themselves have settled the claims do not come under this statement.

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—How long will it take the Government to extend the scope of the Regulation to labourers other than those employed in factories?

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN).—It will be done as soon as possible. Government are anxious to do so.

MR. S. K. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR.—Is the Regulation applicable also to Government concerns including the Electrical Department and Municipalities?

MR. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—Yes.

Classification of Voddars, Korachars, etc., under Criminal Tribes.

MR. K. MUNIVENKATAPPA (Minorities).—

Q.—61. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) (i) What are the communities the members of which are generally included in the gang list according to the rules under the Criminal Tribes Regulation, and (ii) what are the offences for which they are liable to be included in the list?

(*b*) Have people of any other community committing similar offences been brought under the gang form?

(*c*) Is it a fact that Government have ordered that Voddars or Korachars who commit offences and get punished should be brought under the gang form?

(*d*) If so, when was such an order issued by Government?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN).—*A.*—(*a*) (i) Kepmaris, Korachars, Voddars, Ghautichors and Handi Jogis (the last only in a few taluks in Bangalore District).

(ii) *Vide* Schedule and Section 3 of the Criminal Tribes Regulation.

(*b*) Rule 333 of the Mysore Police Manual, Vol. I, permits of bringing a group of five or more persons of criminal propensities, who have no fixed place of residence and who keep on the move throughout a part of the country, on the gang form. Mahrattas, Gosayees, Iranees, etc., have been brought on the gang form whenever they come within the definition of a registered gang.

(*c*) Yes.

(*d*) Government notifications dated 18th September 1933 and 2nd December 1933.

Application of a Member of Voddar Community for Appointment as Police Sub-Inspector.

MR. K. MUNIVENKATAPPA (Minorities).—

Q.—62. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) Whether it is a fact that one Mr. K. Narayanaswamy, a graduate of the Voddar community, had applied for the post of a Police Sub-Inspector?

(*b*) If so, why was he not selected for the place though he belonged to the backward community?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN).—

A.—(*a*) One Mr. N. K. Lakshminarainswami, Voddar by caste, who was not a graduate, applied for a Probationary Sub-Inspector's post in November 1933.

(*b*) He was not found suitable.

Contribution by Government or Municipalities to certain communities in the State.

MR. A. THAMMIAH (Minorities).—

Q.—63. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) The extent of contribution made by either Government or municipalities to the under-mentioned communities in the State either in the shape of money or property up to 1934:—

1. Brahmins;
2. Lingayets;
3. Vokkaligars;
4. Kurubars;
5. Christians;
6. Mahomedans;
7. Upparas;
8. Other Hindus?

(*b*) Whether the said contribution is being spent properly?

(*c*) Who is supervising the contribution?

(*d*) What action has Government taken when the funds have not been utilised for the definite public works or transferred to others?

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (MR. M. VENKATANARANAPPA).—

A.—(*a*) to (*d*) The question is not clear.

Appointment of Vanhikula Kshatriyas in State Services.

MR. S. MUNIVENKATAPPA (Minorities).—

Q.—69. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) How many Vanhikula Kshatriyas applied to the Central Recruitment Board according to the new rules (up to 1932, 1933, 1934) and to what classes do they belong?

(*b*) Of these, in which departments have their names been registered and for what appointments?

THE GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI).—

A.—(*a*) The new rules were not in existence during this period.

(*b*) The question does not arise.

MR. S. MUNIVENKATAPPA.—Will the Central Recruitment Board register the names of applicants who have applied subsequent to the issue of the new rules?

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN).—Yes.

Acquisition of a land in Belavatha Village for the formation of a Burial Ground.

MR. S. I. MUMTAZ (Minorities).—

Q.—73. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) Whether the Mahadevi Muslims of the Mysore City had presented a petition to the Dewan Saheb on 14th October 1926, praying for the grant of a burial ground for the community at Mysore?

(*b*) Whether in Government Order No. L. 5000-02—Ml. 13-28-2, dated 29th January 1929, the Government had accorded sanction for the acquisition of 1 acre and 30 guntas of Survey No. 288 of Belavatha Village for the burial ground for the use of the community in the City of Mysore?

(*c*) Whether the Sub-Division Officer addressed the President of the Mysore City Municipality on 4th April 1929 to take charge of the land on 12th April 1929?

(*d*) Whether another petition was addressed to the Dewan Saheb on